

Subject: Route Transfer Study Kick-off Meeting - Phoenix	
Client: Arizona Department of Transportation	
Project: Route Transfer Study	Project No:
Meeting Date: February 11, 2004	Meeting Location: ADOT Engineering Bldg, Phoenix
Notes by: Christopher Clary-Lemon	

Attendees:

- Eric Anderson (MAG)
- Jonathan Crowe (Pima County DOT)
- Bob Davis (Pinal County)
- Bill Leister (CAAG)
- Jon White (MCDOT)
- Arnold Burnham (ADOT, PM)
- Don Mauller (ADOT)
- Mike Connors (HDR, PM)
- Chris Clary-Lemon (HDR)

Notes:

The meeting began with introductions from the nine (9) people who were in attendance. Arnold Burnham (ADOT) and Mike Connors (HDR) presented a PowerPoint presentation that focused on the history of the project, including the schedule over the past few years. Also included in the presentation were notes relevant to State Transportation Board policy on the transfer of state routes, locations of those who have shown interest in the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and issues identified by the State Transportation Board and participants at the Rural Transportation Summit. Mr. Burnham and Mr. Connors then opened up the floor to questions, issues and comments the attendees may have regarding the process and the Study itself.

Eric Anderson (MAG) questioned how new routes were going to be adopted into the State Highway System (i.e. Williams Gateway Parkway). Following a brief discussion, Mr. Connors noted that the Study would look at "local-to-state" transfer as well as "state-to-local" transfer. Mr. Burnham noted that the Study might want to review "urban" and "rural" routes differently, at least in terms of establishing operations criteria.

Bob Davis (Pinal County) stated that one of the routes listed in the Route Transfer and Level of Development Study Executive Summary as a candidate for transfer to the County goes through the Gila River Indian Community and that the County would have no jurisdiction over the route. Policies dealing with transfers to governmental agencies other than cities and counties, e.g. Indian communities and Federal agencies, should be included in the study.

Bill Leister (CAAG) confirmed that roadways on tribal lands would have to be transferred to the Indian Communities, and not the counties within which they fall.

Jon White (MCDOT) noted he was interested in exploring the System Operational Classification (SOC) concept as a replacement for the Level of Development (LOD) concept. Mr. Burnham noted that LOD was originally set-up in the 1980's with the purpose of establishing levels and determining the extent of improvements needed for each facility type.

Mr. White suggested that more than the ARS-required pavement standards be considered in the transfer process, e.g. drainage issues should be addressed. Mr. Burnham stated that in some cases ADOT has been asked to build an ultimate urban section as part of the transfer agreement, when in fact such a cross-section may not be needed for years to come. It was also stated that the ADOT policy of minimal maintenance on candidate transfer routes might lead to higher transfer costs.

Mr. Anderson questioned how far along the development of the SOC has progressed. Mr. Burnham indicated that the acronym was established (but that could change) and everything else is open for discussion.

Mr. White indicated that previous conversations that have occurred seem to be between the wrong people (i.e. maintenance supervisor to maintenance supervisor). This has resulted in a lot of arm waving with little being done. He stressed the importance of better communication between the right people.

Mr. Connors then asked to group their opinion on the make-up of the TAC. He posed the question of how many people should be included, should there be separate meetings, etc. Mr. Burnham also proposed the idea of establishing sub-groups to look at the SOC, policies, etc. and then have the sub-groups present to the entire group. He stressed the notion that everyone's ideas should be heard.

Mr. Davis stated that if the purpose of this committee is to address the issues of the State Transportation Board, then splitting the state into geographic sub-groups might be a good solution. He proposed a geographic division rather than a task division, whereby each sub-group would work all tasks and compromises would provide the final recommendations. Mr. White agreed with this approach. Both seemed to agree that Maricopa, Pima and Pinal Counties would make up one sub-group, with another located in the northern portion of the state and the third located in the southern portion of the state.

Following a question by Mr. Davis as to the duration of this Study, Mr. Burnham said the Study was scheduled to last approximately one year to ensure a thorough review and ample time for all stakeholders to be heard. He indicated the Study could take longer if necessary.

Mr. Anderson again reiterated the need to bring other agencies, including Councils of Governments (COGs), into the process early to get their buy-in on specific criteria.

Jonathan Crowe (Pima County DOT) stated that the primary focus of this Study should be on how the transference of routes will actually play out, especially the financial concerns with respect to local governments. He requested that ADOT be proactive in the collection of maintenance costs and what is being budgeted for improvements on those routes slated for possible transfer. Mr. Connors noted that the Study would accomplish this on a broad level, but not for all routes listed. He stated that the goal of this Study is to establish a process by which the State and local governments can transfer routes, rather than to identify any particular route for transfer.

Mr. Burnham noted that at the end of this Study, there will need to be a list similar to the one included in the Executive Summary, but that the current list is not final and changes (both additions and possibly deletions) are expected. He also noted that it is very important for all TAC members to get the word out in their communities that this Study is taking place. Mr. Davis added that cities will be big players in this process and should be kept informed of the progress being made.

On that note, Mr. Anderson requested that the project team present to the MAG TRC early in the Study process. Mr. Davis stated that all COGs have a TTAC committee that would benefit from hearing the information presented today.

Mr. Crowe asked how often the project team intends for these meetings to take place. Mr. Burnham replied that it depends on the amount of relevant information collected and the need for such meetings. To which Mr.

Connors added the meetings would be held frequently enough to keep everyone current, possibly every two to three months.

Meeting adjourned.